

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**  
**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re application of: Confirmation No. 6479  
Hang Zhang et al. Group Art Unit No.: 2143  
Serial No.: 09/496,600 Examiner: Alina A. Boutah  
Filed: February 2, 2000

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR BROWSING A MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE

**Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**APPLICANTS' REPLY BRIEF ON APPEAL**

Sir:

Applicants submit this brief in reply to the Examiner's Answer mailed May 1, 2007.

Pages 4-25 of the Examiner's Answer repeat the same rationale of prior Office Actions.

These arguments are fully addressed and traversed in Applicants' opening brief.

At page 26, the Examiner argues that certain points in Applicants' brief ("directly querying a router" and "the integration of an HTTP daemon into a packet router") are not recited in the rejected claims. Applicants disagree. Claim 1 recites "receiving at the network packet router an HTTP request message from the browser to obtain the current value of the MIB variable from the network packet router to which the MIB variable value pertains" and "communicating the current value of the MIB variable from the network packet router to which the MIB variable value pertains to the browser using an HTTP reply message." These claim features may be fairly characterized, in shorthand form for purposes of argument in a brief, as "directly querying a router" and "the integration of an HTTP daemon into a packet router." The

fact that Applicants' brief paraphrases the claims does not change the substantive, fundamental differences between the claimed approach and Krishnamurthy.

At pages 26-27, regarding the lack of a suggestion to combine the references, the Examiner's Answer recites cases setting out an appropriate standard, but does not address the substance of Applicants' argument—that the references do not provide teachings that would motivate a skilled artisan to invent Applicants' approach. The Examiner's Answer provides no *evidence* in the references that amounts to a sufficient motivation.

At page 27, the Examiner's Answer seeks to justify the use of hindsight in its conclusion of obviousness by contending that hindsight reconstruction of an invention from the prior art is allowed “so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure ...” (Examiner's Answer at 27). However, the Examiner's Answer does not address the *substance* of Applicants' argument—which is that the Examiner's position *is* based on knowledge from the Applicant's disclosure.

The Examiner's Answer and the prior Office Actions all view the cited prior art through the lens of Applicants' teachings. The Examiner could not have reached a conclusion of obviousness solely from the references, because the references do not show or suggest HTTP request-response capability in a router. The Examiner's reasons for combining the references are derived not from the references themselves, but from Applicants' disclosure; the reasons would not have occurred to a skilled artisan lacking Applicants' disclosure—and in fact, based on the present record, no skilled artisan did create the same thing as Applicants.

The Supreme Court has said that fact-finders must be aware of the distortion caused by hindsight bias, be cautious of relying upon it, avoid the temptation to read into the prior art the teachings of the invention, and guard against the use of hindsight. *KSR v. Teleflex*, 550 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (April 30, 2007, slip op. at 17), citing *Graham v. John Deere & Co. of Kansas City*, 383 U.S. at 36 (1966), quoting *Monroe Auto Equipment Co. v. Heckethorn Mfg. & Supply Co.*, 332 F.2d 406,

Applicants' Reply Brief on Appeal  
Application No. 09/496,600, filed 02/02/2000  
Zhang et al.  
Examiner Alaina Boutah, Art Unit 2143

412 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1964). While the Examiner's Answer appears to recognize the issue, the recognition comes too late, because the Examiner's rejections of the claims have been distorted by hindsight bias.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 1-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over *Krishnamurthy* in view of *Spofford* further in view of *Moeller* lacks the requisite factual and legal bases. Appellants therefore respectfully request that the Honorable Board reverse the rejection of Claims 1-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over *Krishnamurthy* in view of *Spofford* further in view of *Moeller*.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: June 29, 2007

/ChristopherJPalermo#42056/  
Christopher J. Palermo, Reg. No. 42,056

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110-1089  
Tel: (408) 414-1203  
Fax: (408) 414-1076